

PRELIMINARY LISTS OF NEW ENGLAND PLANTS VI,—
LEGUMINOSAE.¹

J. R. CHURCHILL.

[The sign + indicates that an herbarium specimen has been seen; the sign — that a printed record has been found.]

	Me.	N. H.	Vt.	Mass.	R. I.	Conn.
<i>Amphicarpa monoica</i> , Nutt.	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Apios tuberosa</i> , Moench	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Astragalus alpinus</i> , L.	+	+	+			
“ <i>Canadensis</i> , L.			+			
“ <i>Robbinsii</i> , Oakes			+			
“ <i>Blakei</i> , Eggleston	+	+	+			
<i>Baptisia tinctoria</i> , R. Br.	—		+	+	+	+
<i>Cassia Chamaecrista</i> , L.	—			+	+	+
“ <i>Marilandica</i> , L.	—	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>nictitans</i> , L.	—		+	+	+	+
<i>Coronilla varia</i> , L.	+		+	+	—	+
<i>Crotalaria sagittalis</i> , L.	—		+	+	+	+
<i>Cytisus scoparius</i> , Link.				+		
<i>Desmodium acuminatum</i> , DC.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>Canadense</i> , DC.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>canescens</i> , DC.			—	+	+	+
“ <i>ciliare</i> , DC.				+	+	+
“ <i>cuspidatum</i> , T. & G.	—		+	+	—	+
“ <i>Dillenii</i> , Darl.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>Marilandicum</i> , F. Boott	—			+	+	+
“ <i>humifusum</i> , Beck.				—	—	
“ <i>nudiflorum</i> , DC.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>paniculatum</i> , DC.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>rigidum</i> , DC.				+	+	+
“ <i>rotundifolium</i> , DC.	—		—	+	+	+
“ <i>sessilifolium</i> , DC.				+	+	+
“ <i>strictum</i> , DC.						—
<i>Genista tinctoria</i> , L.	+			+		
<i>Hedysarum boreale</i> , Nutt.	+		+			
<i>Lathyrus maritimus</i> , Big.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>ochroleucus</i> , Hook.			+	—		
“ <i>palustris</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ “ <i>var. myrtifolius</i> , Gray.	+		+	+		
“ <i>pratensis</i> , L.	+			+		
<i>Lespedeza angustifolia</i> , Ell.				+		

¹ Printed in RHODORA as supplementary material.

	Me.	N. H.	Vt.	Mass.	R. I.	Conn.
<i>Lespedeza capitata</i> , Michx.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>intermedia</i> , Britt.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>Nuttallii</i> , Darl.	+			+	+	
“ <i>polystachya</i> , Michx.	+		+	+	+	+
“ <i>procumbens</i> , Michx.	-		-	+	+	+
“ <i>Stuvei</i> , Nutt.				+	+	-
“ <i>violacea</i> , L.	-		+	+	-	+
“ <i>reticulata</i> , Pers.				+	+	+
<i>Lupinus perennis</i> , L.	-	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Medicago Arabica</i> , All. (<i>M. maculata</i> , Willd.)	+	-		+	+	
“ <i>hispida</i> , Gaert. (<i>M. denticulata</i> , Willd.)	+	+	+	+	+	
“ <i>laciniata</i> , All.	+			+		
“ <i>lupulina</i> , L.	+	-	+	+	+	+
“ <i>sativa</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Melilotus alba</i> , Lam.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>officinalis</i> , Willd.	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Oxytropis campestris</i> , DC., var. <i>Johannensis</i> , Fernald	+					
<i>Phaseolus perennis</i> , Walt.						+
<i>Robinia hispida</i> , L.				+	+	+
“ <i>Pseudacacia</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>viscosa</i> , Vent.	+	+	+	+		+
<i>Strophostyles angulosa</i> , Ell.	-			+	+	+
<i>Tephrosia Virginiana</i> , Pers.	-			+	+	+
<i>Trifolium agrarium</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>arvense</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>hybridum</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>incarnatum</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>medium</i> , L.	-			+	-	
“ <i>pratense</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>procumbens</i> , L.	+	+	-	+	+	+
“ <i>dubium</i> , Sibth. (<i>T. procumbens</i> , var. <i>minus</i> , Gray)				+		+
“ <i>repens</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Vicia Cracca</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>hirsuta</i> , Koch.				+	+	-
“ <i>sativa</i> , L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
“ “ var. <i>angustifolia</i> , Ser.		-	+	-	+	
“ <i>tetrasperma</i> , Moench	+		+	+	-	+
“ <i>Caroliniana</i> , Walt.	-					

NOTES UPON THE ABOVE LIST.

Amorpha fruticosa, L. (see RHODORA I: 164), and *Gleditsia triacanthos*, L., frequently collected along roadsides, etc., and reported as "escapes," are not well established as wild, but rank rather with the horse-chestnut (RHODORA I: 214), and some other trees, as merely plants of cultivation.

Amphicarpa Pitcheri, T. & G. There are specimens collected in eastern Massachusetts, in the herbarium of Mr. W. P. Rich, which cannot be distinguished from this species. See RHODORA I: 27. I have also seen, in the herbarium of Dr. E. H. Eames of Bridgeport, Conn., plants collected by him near that city, which are almost identical with the western species. Yet mature fruit from this station, which Dr. Eames kindly sent me, quite lacks the hairy valves so characteristic of *A. Pitcheri*. Without further material and study, it seems at least premature to include *A. Pitcheri* in our list as a New England plant.

Astragalus Blakei, Eggleston, Bot. Gazette, XX; 271, June, 1895 (*A. Robbinsii*, Oakes, var. *Jesupi*, Eggleston & Sheldon, Minn. Bot. Studies, XV, 155, June, 1894). Dr. B. L. Robinson has made a careful investigation of the validity of this species, with the result indicated in our list. I add here, also, his interesting notes as follows: "We have in New England, besides *A. alpinus* and *A. Canadensis*, two species of *Astragalus*, namely: 1—*A. Robbinsii*, Oakes, with small, light-colored flowers, and a rather short, flattish pod, which is shortly acuminate, has no dorsal sulcus, and exhibits only the minutest trace of a septum from the dorsal suture. This appears to be a local Vermont species. (Type specimen from Winooski River, Burlington. This station is now extinct.) 2—*A. Blakei*, Eggleston, with larger, more deeply-colored flowers, and longer, acuminate, triangular pods, with dorsal sulcus and a partial septum intruded from the dorsal suture. This species has also borne the names *A. Robbinsii*, var. *occidentalis*, Wats. and *A. occidentalis*, Jones. It is evidently like *A. alpinus*, a species of wide range, extending from Maine, through northern New Hampshire and Vermont, and to the far West."

Mr. W. W. Eggleston tells me that Perkins' report of *Desmodium canescens* in Vermont (based upon Robbins' plant from Pownal) is probably erroneous.

Two species of *Medicago*, not mentioned in the list, but reported in the Flora of Middlesex County, and based upon specimens now in the herbarium of the New England Botanical Club, were incorrectly de-

terminated, and should be revised as follows: *M. aculeata* is *M. agrestis*, Ten., *M. lappacea* is *M. hispida*, Gaertn. var. *apiculata*, Urban. *Trigonella Cassia*, of the same flora, is *T. Noeana*, Boiss. There are other Medics which have crept into local lists, but they are mere waifs or ballast plants, and scarcely deserve mention. Plants equally ephemeral, sometimes collected from dumps, and reported in local floras, are *Lathyrus sativus*, L., *Phaseolus vulgaris*, L., *Pisum sativum*, L., *Lotus corniculatus*, L., *Scorpiurus subvillosus*, L., and others. They are transient relics of cultivation, rarely persistent, and are better omitted.

Regarding *Oxytropis campestris*, DC., see RHODORA I: 85.

Phaseolus perennis, Walt., is credited generally to New England in Gray's Manual and in the Illustrated Flora. It is mentioned as "not common" in Jackson's Flora of Worcester County (Mass.). After a thorough ransacking of our principal herbaria, and correspondence with Mr. Jackson and others, it seems clear that the report of its occurrence in Worcester County is without foundation; and that the record for New England rests at present solely on three specimens, all collected many years ago at New Haven, Conn. One of these sheets, in the Gray Herbarium, is without date, but it bears the stamp of the "Torrey & Gray Flora," and the label reads simply: "Phaseolus perennis, New Haven. Dana." In the Eaton Herbarium at New Haven is a specimen collected by A. B. Eaton at New Haven in 1859. The third sheet is in the Herbarium of Columbia College; and for the account of the ancient and fragmentary specimen thereon I am indebted to Mr. Roland M. Harper, student of botany in the University. The label reads as follows: "P. perennis. New Haven, Ct. recd. by Dr. Robbins from Shephard or Shorter. This is my only specimen. I should be glad to have you tell me if it is perennis & send it back when convenient." This sheet, too, bears the stamp, "Torrey Herbarium," but the label is neither signed nor dated. Dr. Britton, affirming the authenticity of the specimen, ventures the opinion that the label is in the handwriting of Oakes. Now will our New Haven botanists tell us where the station was and whether it is now extinct?

Trifolium stoloniferum, Muhl., is reported in Perkins' Catalogue of Vermont Plants, from Bellows Falls. President Brainerd writes that it is doubtless an error, or possibly a waif. No specimen is extant, and no recent collector has been able to find it there.

Vol. 2, No. 15, including pages 53 to 74 and plate 15, was issued March 6, 1900,